

ABSTRACT

In today's economy, companies are increasingly facing challenges in a global market and rapid shifts in technology. The competition due to the economy demands people's knowledge and skills to be constantly updated. Making a growing number of companies developed a new learning culture. In the past, companies have viewed training as a necessary expense rather than an investment. As such, emphasis was placed by cutting the expenses of training and at the same time the training is hoped to be more efficient, as it is part of investment. The knowledge and skills of the employees are now being held on equal basis with the company's monetary asset. Learning faster than other companies represents one of the most important competitive advantages. Here the Internet technology represents an unprecedented opportunity for training departments to add value to the companies through e-learning practice. The method is viewed as cost effective and is now overwhelmingly practiced by most companies. Despite its benefits, the companies are in doubt of whether e-learning is effective enough to be a sole method of training besides it is cost effective. This is particularly true when FCM company where this study was carried out, experienced increasing number of accidents when it applies e-learning as a primary method of training. The study was conducted to 50 technical employees in the Company to determine whether participant perceive e-learning training is more effective than blended training. A survey was used during the quantitative phase with the data analyzed using an independent t test and multiple regression test. From the t test, it is found that there is a significant difference in the training effectiveness between the two methods. While, multiple regression test was used to determine whether there were correlated between the relationship of two independent variables (behavior and cost of injury) and dependent variable (training effectiveness), which yielded sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there were correlation between the variables. During the qualitative phase, interviews were used to identify the attributes that enhanced or distracted from e-learning training. Results indicated that employees demonstrated a prefer blended training over e-learning training. Even though, top managements of the company are encouraged to emphasis an e-learning due to cost-effective and at the same time translate the e-learning model into practice.

ABSTRAK

Dalam ekonomi hari ini, banyak syarikat menghadapi cabaran dalam pasaran global dan perubahan pesat teknologi. Persaingan ekonomi menuntut pengetahuan orang ramai dan kemahiran yang sentiasa dikemas kini. Ia mempengaruhi semakin banyak syarikat membangunkan budaya pembelajaran yang baru. Pada masa lalu, syarikat melihat latihan sebagai perbelanjaan yang perlu dan bukannya sebagai pelaburan. Oleh itu, penekanan telah diletakkan dengan mengurangkan perbelanjaan latihan dan pada masa yang sama latihan itu adalah diharapkan untuk menjadi lebih efisien, kerana ia adalah sebahagian daripada pelaburan. Pengetahuan dan kemahiran pekerja di dalam organisasi kini sebagai dasar aset kewangan syarikat. Pembelajaran yang lebih cepat berbanding syarikat lain merupakan salah satu kelebihan berdaya saing. Teknologi internet merupakan peluang yang baru dalam latihan pekerja untuk menambah nilai sebuah syarikat melalui pelaksanaan latihan secara online. Memandangkan, latihan secara online dilihat sebagai kos yang efektif, semakin banyak syarikat mengamalkannya. Walaubagaimanapun, pada masa yang sama kemalangan masih berlaku di tempat kerja. Disebalik kos yang efektif, kebanyakan syarikat masih ragu-ragu sama ada e-pembelajaran cukup berkesan untuk dijadikan sebagai kaedah tunggal latihan. Ini adalah benar khususnya apabila syarikat FCM di mana kajian ini telah dijalankan, mengalami kemalangan yang semakin meningkat apabila ia mengamalkan latihan secara online sebagai satu kaedah utama latihan. Kajian ini telah dijalankan untuk 50 orang pekerja teknikal dalam organisasi untuk menentukan sama ada peserta melihat latihan secara online adalah lebih berkesan daripada latihan dicampur. Tinjauan yang telah digunakan semasa fasa kuantitatif dengan data dianalisis menggunakan ujian t dan ujian regresi berganda. Dari ujian t, didapati bahawa terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan dalam keberkesanan latihan antara kedua-dua kaedah. Sementara itu, ujian regresi berganda telah digunakan untuk menentukan sama ada terdapat hubungan antara dua pemboleh ubah bebas (tingkah laku dan kos pekerja yang cedera) dan pemboleh ubah bersandar (latihan keberkesanan), yang menghasilkan bukti yang mencukupi untuk menolak hipotesis nol bahawa terdapat korelasi antara pemboleh ubah. Semasa fasa kualitatif, temu bual telah digunakan untuk mengenal pasti ciri-ciri terhadap keberkesanan latihan secara online. Hasil kajian menunjukkan responden memberi keutamaan kepada latihan kombinasi online dan traditional berbanding latihan secara online semata-mata. Oleh kerana kos yang efektif, pihak pengurusan atasan syarikat adalah digalakkan untuk memberi penekanan terhadap latihan secara online dan pada masa yang sama menterjemahkan model latihan secara online sebagai satu amalan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUSPEVISOR’S DECLARATION	
STUDENT’S DECLARATION	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	v
ABSTRAK	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
LIST OF APPENDICES	xvii

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Background of the Study	5
1.3	Background of Problem	7
1.4	Statement of Problem	9
1.5	Purpose of the Study	10
1.6	Research Question	11
1.7	Statement of Hypothesis	12
1.8	Significance of the Study	12
1.9	Scope of the Study	14
1.10	Operational Definition	14
1.11	Summary	18

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Introduction	19
2.2	Safety and Health Training	19
2.3	Defining Training	22
2.4	Training Trends	22
2.5	Blended Training	24
2.6	E-learning	25
2.6.1	Strategic Foundation for e-learning	26
2.6.2	Basic Design for E-learning	26
2.6.2.1	Types of Delivery	26
2.6.2.2	Computer Based Training	27
2.6.2.3	Learning Management System	27
2.6.3	Benefits of E-learning	28
2.6.4	E-learning issue	30
2.6.5	E-learning in corporate	32
2.6.6	E-learning in Malaysia	33
2.6.7	Future E-learning	33
2.7	Training Effectiveness	35
2.7.1	Management Support	35
2.7.2	Timelines of Training	35
2.7.3	Training Flexibility	37
2.7.4	Dividing e-learning programmes into smaller module units	38
2.8	Barrier to Training Effectiveness	39
2.8.1	learners' lack of self-efficacy in their computer skills.	39
2.8.2	Lack of face-to-face contact.	40
2.8.3	Participants' lack of self-efficacy with technology.	41
2.9	How is Effectiveness Determined?	43
2.9.1	Training Transfer (Motivation)	43
2.9.2	Training Transfer (Climate)	44
2.9.3	Training Transfer (Design)	45
2.9.4	Training Outcomes(Learning)	45
2.9.5	Training Outcome (safety context).	47
2.9.6	Organizational Results	48
2.10	Models for Evaluation of Training	49
2.10.1	Systems approach or input, process, output (IPO) model	49
2.10.2	Context, input, process, and product	

2.10.3	Context, input, reaction, and outcome (CIRO) model	51
2.10.4	Brinkerhoff's six-stage evaluation model.	51
2.10.5	Kaufman and Keller's five levels of evaluation.	52
2.10.6	Holton's three levels HRD evaluation and research model	52
2.11	A review of selected Evaluation Models Kirkpatrick Four-Level Approach	54
2.12	Advantage and disadvantage Kirkpatrick model	60
2.13	The similarities and differences of the selected evaluation models.	62
2.14	Cost saving and Cost effectiveness (ROI)	66
2.14.1	Internal rate of return (IRR)	66
2.14.2	Cost-benefit ratio	67
2.14.3	Bottom-line evaluation method	67
2.14.4	Payback period	67
2.14.5	Return On Investment (ROI)	67
2.15	Summary	69

CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	70
3.2	The Theoretical Framework on Training Effectiveness Evaluation	71
3.3	Research Design	76
3.4	Sample of The Study	77
3.5	Description of Materials, Construction and Design Instruments	79
3.5.1	Closed ended questionnaire	80
3.5.2	Open ended questionnaire	81
3.6	Pilot Study	82
3.6.1	Validity and Flexibility of Instruments	83
3.7	Quantitative Research Procedure	84
3.8	Data Analysis	87
3.8.2	Hypothesis Test	

3.9	Methodological Assumption Limitation, Delimitations	91
	3.9.1 Cover Letter and Informed Consent	91
	3.9.2 Beneficence	91
3.10	Summary	97

CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS OF DATA

4.1	Introduction	95
4.2	Research Question	96
4.3	Statement of Hypothesis	96
4.4	Population and Sampling	97
4.5	Respondents Demographics	99
4.6	Quantitative Analysis Result	102
	4.6.1 The Four Levels Of Training Evaluation Analysis By an Independent Sample t-test and Frequency Rate	102
	4.6.2 The Data Analysis by Correlation and Multiple Regression Test	122
	4.6.3 The Data Analysis by Calculation (ROI Method)	123
4.7	Interview Data Collection	136
4.8	Interview Result	145
4.9	Summary	148

CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATION

5.1	Introduction	149
5.2	Discussion	149
5.3	Summary of Research Findings	171
5.4	Conclusion	171
5.5	Recommendation	174
	5.5.1 The Development of e-learning m	

5.6	Summary	186
5.7	Comparison with related work	187
5.8	Future Work	188

REFERENCES

APPENDDICES

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page
2.1	The Total number of incidents industry (2001-2009)	21
3.1	Table 3.1 Number of employees in both groups.	79
3.2	Table 3.2 Reliability Statistics	84
3.3	Hypothesis Test	87
4.1	Number of E-learning Group and Blended Group	98
4.2	Details of Respondents Demographic	99
4.3	Level 1 (Reaction) Evaluation	103
4.4	Mean Score In Level 1 (Reaction) at Overall Score	107
4.5	T-test Analysis on the Mean Scores of Level 1 (Reaction)	107
4.6	Mean Score in Level 1 (Reaction) According to the Training Contents, Facilities, Schedule and Training Objective.	108
4.7	T-test Analysis on the Mean Score of Level 1 (Reaction) According to Training Contents.	109
4.8	T-test Analysis on the Mean Score of Level 1 (Reaction) According to Training Facilities.	109
4.9	T-test Analysis on the Mean Score of Level 1 (Reaction) According to Training Schedule.	110
4.10	T-test Analysis on the Mean Score of Level 1 (Reaction) According to Training Objective.	110
4.11	Level 2 (Learning) Evaluation.	111
4.12	Mean Score in Level 2 (Learning) at Overall Score.	112
4.13	T-test Analysis on the Mean at Level 2 (Learning) at Overall Scores.	112

Table No.	Title	Page
4.14	Mean Score in Level 2 (Learning) according to the Knowledge, Skill and Attitude.	113
4.15	T-test Analysis on the Mean Score Level 2 (Learning) According to the Knowledge.	115
4.16	T-test Analysis on the Mean Score Level 2 (Learning) According to the Knowledge.	115
4.17	T-test Analysis on the Mean Score Level 2 (Learning) According to the Attitude.	115
4.18	Level 3 (Behavior) Evaluation.	116
4.19	Mean Score in Level 3 (Behavior) at Overall Scores	117
4.20	T-test analysis on the Mean Score Level 3 (Behavior) at Overall Scores.	118
4.21	Level 4 (Result of Cost Employees Injured) at Overall Scores.	119
4.22	Mean Score in Level 4 (Result of Cost Employees Injured) at Overall Scores.	120
4.23	T-test analysis on the Mean Score Level 4 (Result of Cost Employees Injured) at Overall Scores.	121
4.24	Mean Score at Overall Scores at (Four Level of Kirkpatrick Model).	121
4.25	T-test at Overall Scores at (Four Level of Kirkpatrick Model).	123
4.26	Training cost effective	134
4.27	Correlation of Training effectiveness in employees' behaviour and result of cost employees injury.	135
4.28	Summary Hierarchical Regression Analysis with employee reaction, employee learning achievement, employee behavior and cost of employees' injury, predicting training effectiveness.	148

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Title	Page
1.1	The Total Number of Completed Training Per Hour	6
1.2	The Graph of an Accidents Frequency and The Total E-learning in Safety and Health.	9
2.1	Safety Training at the Core of the Safety and Health Program.	20
2.2	Training Evaluation Based on Kirkpatrick Model (Nickols, 2000).	54
3.1	Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Training Evaluation as an Effective Evaluation on Framework of Training.	72
3.2	Phase 1: Quantitative Analysis Step (Kimberly A.Gaither, 2009)	86
4.1	The Correlation coefficient (R) between course content and training effectiveness of e-learning and blended training.	124
4.2	The Correlation coefficient (r) between training facilities and training effectiveness of e-learning and blended training.	125
4.3	The Correlation coefficient (r) between training schedule and training effectiveness of e-learning and blended training.	126
4.4	The Correlation coefficient (r) between training objective and training effectiveness of e-learning and blended training.	127
4.5	The Correlation coefficient (r) between knowledge and training effectiveness of e-learning and blended training.	128
4.6	The Correlation coefficient (r) between skills and training effectiveness of e-learning and blended training.	130

Figure No.	Title	Page
4.7	The Correlation coefficient (r) between attitude and training effectiveness of e-learning and blended training.	131
4.8	The Correlation coefficient (r) between behavior and training effectiveness of e-learning and blended training.	131
4.9	The Correlation coefficient (r) between cost of employee injured and training effectiveness of e-learning and blended training.	132
5.1	The Mean score for two independent group e-learning and blended training.	156
5.2	An E-learning Implementation Model on Self Independence	175

LIST OF APPENDICS

Appendix No.	Title	Page
Appendix A	Closed ended questionnaire	200
Appendix B	Open ended questionnaire	210
Appendix C	Letter ask permission	214
Appendix D	T-Test Analysis Result	216
Appendix E	List of Publication	219

REFERENCES

- Aczel/Sounderpandian.(2002).McGraw-Hill/Irwin. © The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., 5-1.
- Aldrich, C. (2004) Simulation and the Future of Learning: An Innovative (and Perhaps Revolutionary)Approach to e-Learning, Pfeiffer, San Francisco, pp 4-5.
- A.J Veal. (2006). Research Methods for Leisure and Tourism:A Practical. FT Prentice Hall. pp 7-9.
- Alexander, S. (2001). "E-learning Developments and Experiences", Education + Training, **4**(5): 240-247.
- Alexander, S.(2001).Lessons in e-learning. Computerworld,**35**(41), 30-31. Retrieved September 15, 2010, from WilsonSelectPlus database.
- Alexandros, G.S. (2008). Employee perceived training effectiveness relationship to employee attitudes. *Journal of European Industrial Training*. **32**: 63-76.
- Alliger, G. M., & Janak, E. A. (1989). Kirkpatrick's levels of training criteria: Thirty years later. *Personnel Psychology*. **42**: 331-342.
- Armour, S. (2005, Nov 6). Generation Y: They've arrived at work with a new attitude.*USA Today*, p. B.1.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA : Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Asirvatham, D; Azizah; Ewe, H.T.; Woods, P.C. & Tengku Putri Norishah (2004) Country Report:Development of e-Learning in Malaysia. Presentation slides of the 3rd Asian e-Learning Network Conference, December 15-17, Singapore [Online] <http://www.asia-elearning.net/content/conference/2004/>.
- Banks, L.V. (2004). A comparative study on the effectiveness of content delivery modalities (Doctoral dissertation, Touro University International).Dissertation Abstracts International, **02**(65)
- Basarab, D.J. (2001). *The training evaluation process*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bates, R. (2004). A critical analysis of evaluation practice: the Kirkpatrick model and the principle of beneficence. *Evaluation and Program Planning* .**27**: 341–347.
- Berk, J.A. (2003). The buzz surrounding learning Analytics. Knowledge Advisors. Retrieved May 8, 2010 from http://knowledgeadvisors.com/art_3.asp.

- Burke, M. (2006). Relative Effectiveness of Worker Safety and Health Training Methods. Relative Effectiveness of Worker Safety and Health Training Methods, *American Journal of Public Health*. **96**:315-324.
- Blass, E., & Davis, A. (2003). Building on solid foundations: establishing criteria for e-learning development. *Journal of Further & Higher Education*. **27**(3): 227.
- Bledsoe, M. D. (1999). Correlations in Kirkpatrick's training evaluation model. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 2000). *Dissertation Abstract International*, A60/07, **54**.
- Bomberger, D. W. (2003). Evaluation of training in human service organizations: A qualitative case study. (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstract International*. **64**(12):162.
- Broad, M. L. (2005). Beyond transfer of training: Engaging systems to improve performance. San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
- Burns, A. D. (2005, February). E-learning: The future of quality training. *Quality Progress*, **38**(2): 50-57.
- Bushnell, D. S. (1990). Input, process, output: A model for evaluating training. *Training and Development Journal*, March, 41-43.
- Brinkerhoff, R. O. (2005). The success case method: a strategic evaluation approach to increasing the value and effect of training. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, **7**(1): 86-101.
- Cappel, J., & Hayen, R. (2004). Evaluating E-learning: A case study *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, **44**(4): 49-56.
- Caine, R. N., & Caine, G. (1991). *Making connections: Teaching and the human brain*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Cereijo, M. (2006). Attitude as Predictor of Success in Online Training, *International Journal of E-Learning*, **5**: 623-639.
- Chen, N.S. & Lin, K.M (2002) "Factors affecting e-learning for achievement", Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT 2002), [Online] Available: http://ltf.ieee.org/icalt2002/proceedings/t502_icalt148_End.pdf [2005, March 29].
- Chai Lee Goi (2009) E-learning in Malaysia: Success Factors in Implementing E-learning Program, **20**: 237-246
- Chih-Ming C., Hahn-Ming L. and Ya-Hui C. (2005). Personalized E-learning System Using Item Response Theory, *Computers & Education*, **44**(3): 237-255.

- Chou, S.W. & Liu, C.H. (2005) "Learning effectiveness in a Web-based virtual learning environment: a learner control perspective", *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, **21**(1): 65.
- Clark, R.C. & Mayer, R.E. (2002). *e-Learning and the Science of Instruction: Proven Guidelines for Consumers and Designers of Multimedia Learning*, Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer, USA.
- Claroline.net (2005) Claroline: Open Source e-Learning, [Online] Available: <http://www.claroline.net/> [2005, July 28].
- Cox, S., & Cheyne, A. (2000). Assessing safety culture in offshore environments. *Safety Science*, **34**, 111-119
- Cohen A, Colligan MJ. *Assessing Occupational Safety and Health Training*. Cincinnati, Ohio: National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health; 1998. NIOSH publication. 98-145.
- Cohen, A., & Nachmias, R. (1998) The Implementation of a Cost Effectiveness Analyzer for Web-Supported Academic Instruction: A Case Study, *American Journal of Distance Education*.
- Cohen, A., & Colligan, M.J., (1998). *Assessing Occupational Safety and Health Training— A Literature Review*. DHHS (NIOSH) Publication No. 98-145.
- Companies that are Making e-Learning Work, McGraw-Hill, New York. Computing Cases (2005) Why a Social Technical System? [Online] Available: http://www.computingcases.org/general_tools/sia/socio_tech_system.html.
- Cook, J. & Powers, W. (2007). A case study on strengthening workforce training outcomes. *Training & Management Development Methods*. **27**(1): 201-210.
- Colteryahn, K., & Davis, P. (2004, January). Trends you need to know. *T+D: Training and Development*. **58**(1): 28-36.
- Coverstone, P. D. (2003). IT training assessment and evaluation: a case study. *Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Information Technology Curriculum (CITC4'03)*, ACM Press: New York, NY, pp. 206-213.
- Cozby,(2004). *Methods In Behavioral Research* Information Center:Cal State Fullerton & Northcentral University. McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design:Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand oaks,CA:Sage.
- Christoph, R. T., Jr., Schoenfeld, G. A., & Tansky, J. W. (1998, Spring). Overcoming barriers to training utilizing technology: The influence of self efficacy factors on multimedia-based training receptiveness. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*. **9**(1): 25-38.

- Chevalier, R. (2004). Evaluation: the link between learning and performance. *Performance Improvement*. **43** (4): 0-45.
- Craig, W. (July 2001) *E-learning: effective strategies for bullying prevention*. Poster presented at the Biennial meetings of the International Society for the Study of Behavioural Development, Lusaka Zambia.
- Crouch M & McKenzie H (2006). The Logic of Small Samples in Qualitative Research. *Social Science Information*. **45**, 4.
- Christensen, C.R. (1991a). The discussion teacher in action: Questioning, listening, and response. In C. R. Christensen et. al. (Ed). *Education for Judgment: The artistry of discussion leadership* (pp. 153-172). Boston, Mass: The Harvard Business School Press.
- Crucefix, M. (2001). Measuring the effectiveness of safety training, *Occupational Hazard*, **63**(9): 97-98.
- Duggan, S., & Barich, S. (2001). Proceedings from Silicon Valley World Internet Center 2001: *The Knowledge Economy and Corporate eLearning: Current & Upcoming Developments in the U.S. Market*.
- Davis, T.W. and Luthans, F.A. (1980). A social Learning Approach to Organization Behavior. *Academy of management* .**5**: 281-90.
- Dennis,A.(2006). Be a great manager. *Journal of Accountancy*. **201**(5): 55-57. Retrieved October 10, 2010, from Business Source Elite database.
- DeSimone, R. L., & Harris, D. M. (2002). *Human resource development* (3rd ed.). Orlando, FL: The Dryden Press.
- Don Morrison. (2003) *E-Learning strategies: how to get implementation and delivery right first time*, John Wiley, England.
- Dick, W., & Carey, L. (1996). *The systematic design of instruction* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Eva Martinez. (2009) Factors affecting effectiveness in e-learning: An analysis in production management courses. *Journal of Computer Application in Engineering Education*. **19**(3): 572-581.
- Fortune, M. F., Shifflett B., Sibley, R. E. (2006). A Comparison of Online (High Tech) and Traditional (High Touch) Learning in Business Communication Courses in Silicon Valley, *Journal for Education for Business*. **81**(4): 210-214.
- Ford, D. J. (2004). Evaluating performance improvement. *Performance Improvement*, **43**(1): 36-41.

- Franklin, S., & Peat, M. (2001). Managing Change: The Use of Mixed Delivery Modes to Increase Learning Opportunities, *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*. **17**(1): 37–49.
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat*. Farrar, NY: Straus and Giroux.
- Galloway, D. (2005). Evaluating distance delivery and e-learning: Is Kirkpatrick's model relevant? *Performance Improvement*. **44**(4): 21-27.
- Galvin, J. C. (1983). Evaluating management education: Models and attitudes of training specialists. (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1983). *Dissertation Abstract International*. **44**(05): 146.
- Gaytan, J., & McEwen, B. C. (2007). Effective online instructional and assessment strategies. *American Journal of Distance Education*, **21**(3), 117-132.
- Goldstein, IL, and Ford, JK. (2002). *Training in organizations*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Gomez, G. (2001). Easing into e-learning. *Sunday Star*, 10 June, pp. 2-3
- Hakkinen, P. (2002). Challenges for Design of Computer-based Learning Environments, *British Journal of Educational Technology*. **33**(4): 461-469.
- Hara, N., & Kling, R. (1999, December). Student frustrations with a Web-based distance education course. *First Monday*, **12**. Retrieved September 5, 2005, from http://www.firstmonday.org/issues/issue4_12/hara/index.html
- Heaton-Shrestha, C., Gipps, C., Edirisingha, P., Linsey, T. (2007). Learning and E-learning in HE: The Relationship Between Student Learning Styles and VLE use, *Research Papers in Education*, **22** (December), **4**: 443-464.
- Heba, E., & Ahmed, R. (2008) Effectiveness of a blended e-learning cooperative approach in an Egyptian teacher education programme. *Journal of Computers & Education*, **51** (3): 46-65.
- Hilbert, J., Preskill, H. & Russ-Eft, D. (1997). Evaluating training. In Bassi, L. & Russ-Eft, D. (Eds.). *What works: Assessments, development, and measurement*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.
- Herrington, J., Reeves, T. C., & Oliver, R. (2006). A model of authentic activities for online learning. In Juwah (Ed.), *Interactions in Online learning: Implications for theory and practice*. 91-103.
- Holden, R. (1992). Integrating computer-based training: Exploiting the best of CBT at Marks & Spencer. *Education and Training*. **34**(5): 20-26.

- Holton,E.F.(1996).The flawed four-level evaluation model. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*.7: 5-21.
- Holton, E. F., III, & Naquin. S. S. (2004). New Metrics for Employee Development. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*. **17**(1), 56-80.
- Hornback, S. W. (2001). A cost analysis and comparison of computer-assisted instruction and traditional classroom instruction in an industrial setting. (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*. **04** (62). (UMI No. 3011667).
- Horton, W. (2005) Evaluating the e-learning. *Training*, **42**(9), 35-40.
- Huang, H. (2002). Toward Constructivism for Adult Learners in Online Learning Environments, *British Journal of Educational Technology*. **33**(1), 27-37.
- James W. Thacker & P.Nick Blanchard (2007), *Effective Training: systems, strategies, and practice*. Pearson Prentice Hall, USA.
- Jamieson, S. (2004,December). Likert scales: How to (ab) use them. *Medial education*, **38**(12), retrieved on September,2010, from ProQuest database.
- Janicki, T., Steinberg, G. (2003). Evaluation of a Computer-Supported Learning System, Decision Sciences. *The Journal of Innovative Education*. **1**(2): 203-223.
- Júlia Marçal, (2007) Corporate blended learning in Portugal: Current status and future directions, *The European Journal*, Portugal.
- Kearsley, G. (2000). *Technology-Based Learning: maximizing human performance and corporate success*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press LLC.
- Keegan D (2000) The future of learning. From d-learning to m-Learning 111 *Biennale Internazionale Sulla Didattica Universitaria*, Padova,. 25-27 .
- Keller.(2003). Interactive Safety Management Tool. Retrieved September 5, 2010 from/:<http://www.kelleronline.com/topics/TopicInfo.aspx?topickey=1188&doctype=15&pagekey=234062&linktype=0&linkdata=511333>.
- Kerlinger, F. (1964). *Foundations of behavioral research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kim, K. J. (2005). Motivational influences in self-directed online learning environments: A qualitative case study. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, **08** (66). (UMI No.3183486).
- Kirkpatrick (1998). *Evaluating training programs the four levels*. San Francisco, Calif: Berrett-Koehler.

- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (2006). *Evaluating Training Programs*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L. (2005). Revisiting Kirkpatrick's four-level model. *Training and Development*. **50** (1), 54-57.
- Kimberly,A.G.(2009). Comparing perceived effectiveness of e-learning and traditional training in the business environment.Prescott Valley, Arizona,
- Klein, H.J., Noe, R.A. and Wang, C. (2006), "Motivation to learn and course outcomes: the impact of delivery mode, learning goal orientation, and perceived barriers and enablers",*Personnel Psychology*. **59**: 665-702.
- Knowles, M. (2006). *Informal Adult Education, Self-direction and Andragogy*. Retrieved December 8,2010, from <http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-knowl.htm>.
- Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Salas, E. (1997). An organizational systems approach for the implementation and transfer of training. In J. K. Ford (Ed.), *Improving training effectiveness in work organizations* (pp. 247–290). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Kurt Kraiger (2002), *Creating, implementing, and managing effective training and development*. Jossey – Bass Inc, California.
- Leedy, Paul. D, and Ormrod, Jeanne E. (2001). *Practical Research: Planning and Design*. (7th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Lewis, N. J., & Orton, P. (2000). The five attributes of innovative E-Learning. *Training & Development*, **54**(6), 47.
- Lin Thompson and Reece Lamshed. (2006). *E-learning within the Building and Construction and Allied Trades*. Department of education science and training.
- Long, L K., DuBois, C. Z., & Faley, R. H. (2008). Online training: the value of capturing trainee reactions. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, **20**(1): 21-37.
- Lou, Y., Abrami, P. C., & d'Apollonia, S. (2001). Small group and individual learning with technology: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, **71**(3): 449-521.
- Lyer et al. (2005). mining safety and health research..oxford journal,**71**:238–44
- Mager, R. F. (1984). *Preparing instructional objectives* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: David S. Lake Publishers.
- McLaren, C. (2004). A Comparison of Student Persistence and Performance in Online and Classroom Business Statistics Experiences, Decision Sciences. *The Journal of Innovative Education*. **2**(1):1-10.
- Mestre, L. (2006). Accommodating Diverse Learning Styles in an Online Environment. *Information Literacy and Instruction*. **46**(2).

- Moller, L., F., W., & Huett, J. (2008). The evolution of distance education: Implications for instructional design on the potential of the web. *TechTrends*. **52**: 70 – 75.
- Mullich, J. (2004). A second act for e-learning: Part 1 of 2. *Workforce Management*. **83**(2), 51-53.
- Mungania, P. (2004). Employees' perceptions of barriers in e-learning: The relationship among barriers, demographics, and e-learning self-efficacy. (Doctoral dissertation, University of
- Marcel R. van der Klink, Jan N. Streumer, (2002) "Effectiveness of on-the-job training", *Journal of European Industrial Training*. **26** (4):196 - 199
- Mathews, J.M., & Hudson, A.M. (2001). Guidelines for evaluating parent training programs. *Family Relation.*, **50**(1), 77-87.
- Mahapatra, R. & Lai, V. S. (2005). Evaluating end-user training programs. *Communications of the ACM*. **48**(1):67-70.
- McCain, Donald V. (2005). *Evaluation Basics*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training & Development.
- Nelson, G. (2001). Do no harm: A first measure of effectiveness in small distance education programs. *Proceedings of ED-MEDIA 2001: World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia, and Telecommunications*. June, Tampere, Finland.
- Neuhauser, C. (2002). Learning Style and Effectiveness of Online and Face-to-Face Instruction, *The American Journal of Distance Education*. **16**(2):99-113.
- Nickols, F. (2000). Evaluating Training There is no "cookbook" approach. Retrieved October 2, 2010. from: <http://home.att.net/~nickols/evaluate.htm>.
- Newstrom, J. W. (1995). Review of Evaluating training programs: the four levels by D.L. Kirkpatrick. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, **6** :317–319.
- Noyes, J., Garland, K. and Robbins, L. (2004), Paper-based versus computer-based assessment: is workload another test mode effect? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, **35**(1):111-113.
- Noe, R. A., & Schmitt, N. (1986). The influence of trainee attitudes on training effectiveness: Test of a model. *Personnel Psychology*. **39**: 497–523.
- Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), (April, 2011). Week news , Malaysia.
- Peretti, K. (2008, April 14). IT training – On the job. *Training Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.trainingmag.com/msg/contentdisplay/training>
- Passerini, K., Granger, M. (2000). A Developmental Model for Distance Learning Using the Internet, *Computers & Education*. **34**: 1-15.

- Perez Cereijo, M. V. (2006). Attitude as Predictor of Success in Online Training. *International Journal on ELearning*, **5**(4): 623-639.
- Philips, J., & Stone, R. (2002). How to measure training results. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Piskurich, G. M. (2006). E-Learning Fast, Cheap, and Good, Performance Improvement. **45** (1):18- 25.
- Poole, J. (2006). E-Learning and Learning Styles: Students' Reactions to Web-based Language and Style at Blackpool and Fylde College, Language and Literature. **15**(3): 307-320.
- Posavac, E.J. and Carey, R.G. (1997). Program Evaluation: Methods and Case Studies (5th ed.) New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Raisinghani, M. S., Chowdhury, M., Colquitt, C, Reyes, P.M. Bonakder, N., Ray, J., & Robels, J. (2005). Distance Education in the Business Aviation Industry: Issues and Opportunities. *International Journal of Distance Education Technologies*. **3**(1): 20-43.
- Raymond A. Noe. (2008). Employee Training and Development. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Redding, T. R., and Rotzien, J. (1999). Comparative analysis of SDL online training with traditional classroom instruction. Presented at the 14th International Symposium on Self-Directed Learning.
- Robothom, G. (2001). Safety training that works. *Professional Safety*. **46**(5):33-37.
- Robert W. Taylor, (2002) "Pros and cons of online learning – a faculty perspective", *Journal of European Industrial Training*. **26** (1):24 – 37
- Rouiller, J. Z., & Goldstein, I. L. (1993). The relationship between organizational transfer climate and positive transfer of training. *Human Resources Development Quarterly*. **4**:377–390.
- Ruiz, G. R., Mintzer, M. J., & Leipzig, R. M. (2006). The impact of e-learning in medical education. *Academic Medicine*. **81**(3):207 – 212.
- Schoefeld-Tacher, R., McConnell, S. and Graham, M. (2001). Do no harm - A comparison of the effects of on-line vs. traditional delivery media on a science course. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*. **10**(3):257-265.
- Schoenfeld, J., & Berge, Z. L. (2004). Emerging ISD models for distance training programs. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*,. **33**(1): 29-37.

- Schmeeckle, J. M. (2002). Online training: An evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of training law enforcement personnel over the Internet. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, **02** (61).
- Schank, R.C. and Kemi, J. (2000). Extracurriculars as the curriculum: A vision of education for the 21st century. White Paper presented to the US Department of Education. Chicago: Northwestern University and Cognitive Arts Corporation.
- Strother, J. (2002), An Assessment of the Effectiveness of e-Learning in Corporate Training Programs, *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*. **3**(1).
- Stufflebeam, D. (2002). *CIPP evaluation model checklist* . Retrieved August 1, 2010 from <http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/checklists/cippchecklist.htm>.
- Spitzer, D., & Conway, M. (2002). *Link training to your bottom-line*. Infoline. Alexandria, VA: ASTD.
- Tai, L. (2005). *Corporate e-learning: How e-learning is created in three large corporations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania. Retrieved July 9, 2010 from ProQuest database.
- Tan Kim, 2010. *IT Office, Internet facilities, Gebeng, Kuantan*. Interview:30 Dec.
- Tidler, Karen Louise. (1999). Evaluation of continuing medical education using Kirkpatrick's four levels of evaluation. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1999). *Dissertation Abstract International*. **61**(01), 140.
- Tracy, J. B., Hinkin, T. R., Tannenbaum, S., & Matheiu, J. E. (2001, Spring). The influence of individual characteristics and the work environment on varying levels of training outcomes. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, **12**(1): 5-23.
- Tran Thanh Dien. (2006). An effectiveness Online learning environment. Open Educational Resource. Cantho University .Retrieved July 9, 2011 from ProQuest database.
- Tyler, K. (2000, May). Hold on to what you've learned. *HR Magazine*. **45**(5):94- 102.
- Wang, G. (2003). Valuing learning: the measurement journey. *Educational Technology*. **43**(1): 32–37.
- Warr, P., Bird, M. & Rackham, N. (1970). *Evaluation of management training*. *Training and Development*. **45**(1): 54-57.
- Wutoh, R., Boren, S. A., & Balas, E. A. (2004). E-Learning: A review of internet-based continuing medical education. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*. **24**(1): 20-30.

- Wahab, 2010. *Human Resource Office, Safety training, Gebeng, Kuantan, Pahang*. Interview:17 oct.
- Yamnill, S. & McLean, G. N. (2001). Theories supporting transfer of training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*. **12**(2): 195–208.
- Zerr, R. (2007). A quantitative and qualitative analysis of the effectiveness of online homework in first-semester calculus. *The journal of Computers and Mathematics and Science Journal*. **26**(1).
- Zhang, D. (2005). Interactive Multimedia-Based E-Learning: A Study of Effectiveness, *American Journal of Distance Education*. **19** (3): 149-162.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Companies are increasingly facing new challenges in today's new economy. Increasing competition in a globalised market, shrinking corporate resources, maturing markets, rapid shifts in technology, and the recruitment and retention of talented and skilled people are just a few of these challenges. Therefore, the Human resource developers are increasingly being challenged to respond to a changing work environment that is demanding "just-in-time training" for employees. The purpose is to produce competent human performance and to continually update their skills besides employees to getting familiar with the usual policies and new work system requirement of the company. They also have to adapt with the technology being employed.

Many manufacturers are creating enterprise-wide compliance training programmes by hiring additional trainers, recruiting supervisors to teach classes, extending shifts to provide additional training and constructing classrooms within the plant. Organisations are doubling their instructor-led training efforts to ensure that employees are receiving more hours of training. The strategy is to provide as much classroom training to employees as possible.

Traditionally, all the training classes have been taught in a face to face classroom. Recent years, most organisations acquired technology for business purpose. The question that arises, is whether use of this technology for training will effectively and efficiently enable employees to transfer the skills that they are taught for the workplace.